

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-14 are now pending in the application. Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended herein. Claims 2 and 9 have been canceled herein without prejudice. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### I. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1, 5-8, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,426,787 (Satake). Claims 2-4, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on a combination of Satake and U.S. Patent No. 6,097,458 (Tsuda). Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable for at least the following reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

One of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8 is directed to a diffusion reflector having projections on an incident surface of a specular reflector. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to further clarify this aspect of the invention. Independent claim 1, for example, requires that "the light-diffusion portion includes a number of projections arranged at a distance from each other," and that "the projections are provided on an *incident surface* of the specular reflector." The first portion of the above-identified limitations is recited in original claim 2. The latter portion of the limitations is disclosed in Fig. 2 and its corresponding description of the present specification. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

An object of one exemplary embodiment of the invention is to diffuse reflected light utilizing a specular reflector. Such diffusion mechanism can be achieved by a light-diffusion portion including projections which are on an incident surface of the specular reflector. Specifically, according to an exemplary embodiment, the light-diffusion portion 42 is provided on an incident side with respect to the specular reflector 41. See, Fig. 2 of the present application.

In rejecting claims 2 and 9, the Office Action acknowledges that the Satake patent fails to suggest the claimed light-diffusion portion including a number of projections arranged at a distance from each other. In order to make up the deficiencies of the Satake patent, the Office Action cites the Tsuda patent as describing the claimed projections. However, the Tsuda patent fails to suggest that the projections are provided on an *incident surface* of the specular reflector, as claimed.

As illustrated in Figs. 1F and 4, the Tsuda device has its asymmetric convex portion 12c on an *opposite side of the incident side* with respect to the thin metal film 14. Therefore, it is

respectfully submitted that the Tsuda device shown in Figs. 1F and 4 cannot be said to suggest the claimed projections provided on an *incident surface* of the specular reflector. Therefore, Tsuda does not cure the deficiencies of Satake.

In summary, Applicants find nothing in the prior art that suggests the claimed projections on an incident surface of the specular reflector as recited in independent claims 1 and 8. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined in independent claims 1 and 8, and their dependent claims is patentable over the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

## II. CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance at an early date. If the Examiner has any continuing concerns about patentability of the claimed invention, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 510-663-1100, ext 245.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Haruo Yawata  
Limited Recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
510-663-1100, ext. 245